



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/516,082	03/01/2000	Satoshi Murakami	SEL163	3545

7590 06/11/2003

Cook Alex Mcfarron Manzo  
Cummings & Mehler LTD  
200 West Adams ST  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

LEE, EUGENE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2815

DATE MAILED: 06/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/516,082	Applicant(s) MURAKAMI ET AL.
	Examiner Eugene Lee	Art Unit 2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### **Status**

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2003 .

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 46-70 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 46-70 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 52 thru 55, 58, 61, 64, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 52, line 11, the applicant does not disclose “a second interlayer insulation film comprising at least a material selected from the group consisting of silicon nitride, silicon oxide and nitrated silicon oxide”. It appears that the applicant is referring to passivation film 375 as “a second interlayer insulation film” since the layer 2302 is formed over the color filter and not vice versa (as stated in the claim). However, there is no disclosure of the passivation film comprising at least a material selected from the group consisting of silicon nitride, silicon oxide, and nitrated silicon oxide.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 52 thru 55, 58, 61, 64, and 67 thru 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 52-55, 58, 61, 64 and 67, it is unclear what the applicant is referring to as the “second interlayer insulation film”. On page 97, line 3 of the applicant’s specification, the applicant refers to element 2302 as the second interlayer insulating film. However, in FIG. 28A, it is impossible for the element 2302 to be the second interlayer insulating film because the applicant states in claim 52 “a color filter formed over the second interlayer insulating film”. The color filter 2301 is **under** the second interlayer insulating film 2302. The Examiner has provisionally interpreted the passivation film 375 as the actual “second interlayer insulating film”, however, appropriate clarification and correction are required. Related to paragraph 2 above.

Claims 68 thru 70 recite the limitation "the second electrode" in line 8 of said claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It appears that the applicant is referring to the pixel electrode and second electrode as the same structure. However, appropriate clarification and correction are required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who

has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kadota et al. 5,818,550. Kadota discloses (see, for example, FIG. 1) a semiconductor device comprising a thin film transistor formed over a TFT substrate (insulating surface) 0 wherein the thin film transistor comprises a semiconductor film 2, source and drain region S/D, channel forming region, gate insulating film, gate electrode 3; first inter-layer insulating film (interlayer insulating film) 4, electrodes (conductive layer) 7, color filter 9R/9G/9B, and pixel electrode 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 48 thru 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota et al. '550 as applied to claims 46 and 47 above, and further in view of Seo 6,323,521. Kadota

does not disclose the interlayer insulating film comprising at least a material selected from the group consisting of silicon nitride, silicon oxide and nitrated silicon oxide. However, Seo discloses (see, for example, FIG. 6D) a semiconductor device comprising a gate insulating interlayer (interlayer insulating film) 219 over a thin film transistor. In column 9, lines 3-8, Seo discloses the gate insulating interlayer as being silicon oxide or other suitable material. The gate insulating interlayer covers the gate electrode and active region of the thin film transistor, and provides an adequate material for making contact holes. The contact holes are used to form contacts to source and drain regions of a thin film transistor. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a material selected from the group consisting of silicon nitride, silicon oxide and nitrated silicon oxide for the interlayer insulating film in order to cover the gate electrode and active region of the thin film transistor and provides an adequate material for making contact holes, and since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claim 52-55, Kadota discloses (see, for example, FIG. 1) a semiconductor device comprising a thin film transistor formed over a TFT substrate (insulating surface) 0 wherein the thin film transistor comprises a semiconductor film 2, source and drain region S/D, channel forming region, gate insulating film, gate electrode 3; first inter-layer insulating film (first interlayer insulating film) 4, electrodes (conductive layer) 7, second inter-layer insulating film (second interlayer insulating film) 5, color filter 9R/9G/9B, and pixel electrode 1. Kadota does not disclose the second inter-layer insulating film (second interlayer insulating film)

comprising at least a material selected from the group consisting of silicon nitride, silicon oxide and nitrated silicon oxide. However, Seo discloses (see, for example, FIG. 6D) a semiconductor device comprising a passivation film (second interlayer insulating film) 231 over a thin film transistor. In column 10, lines 2-5, Seo discloses the passivation film as being silicon oxide or silicon nitride. The passivation film covers the source and drain electrodes of the thin film transistor and provides an adequate material for making contact holes. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a material selected from the group consisting of silicon nitride, silicon oxide and nitrated silicon oxide in order to cover the source and drain electrodes of the thin film transistor and provide an adequate material for making contact holes, and since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

9. Claims 56 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota et al. '550 as applied to claims 46 and 47 above, and further in view of Ha 5,677,207. Kadota does not disclose LDD regions in contact with the channel forming region. However, Ha discloses (see, for example, FIG. 3G) a semiconductor device comprising LDD regions 38 in contact with a channel area 32a. In column 1, lines 48-63, Ha discloses that LDD areas reduce the electric field between the drain and channel area. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the LDD regions of Ha in Kadota's invention in order to reduce the electric field between the drain and channel area, and reduce leakage current.

10. Claims 57, 58, 63, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota et al. '550 in view of Seo '521 as applied to claims 48-55 above, and further in view of Ha 5,677,207. Kadota in view of Seo does not disclose LDD regions in contact with the channel forming region. However, Ha discloses (see, for example, FIG. 3G) a semiconductor device comprising LDD regions 38 in contact with a channel area 32a. In column 1, lines 48-63, Ha discloses that LDD areas reduce the electric field between the drain and channel area. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the LDD regions of Ha in Kadota in view of Seo in order to reduce the electric field between the drain and channel area, and reduce leakage current.

11. Claims 59 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota et al. '550 as applied to claims 46 and 47 above, and further in view of Matsumoto 5,323,042. Kadota does not disclose a driver circuit comprising a second thin film transistor, wherein the pixel matrix circuit and the driver circuit are over a same substrate. However, Matsumoto discloses (see, for example, FIG. 1) a semiconductor device comprising a thin film transistor 12 for a matrix circuit and thin film transistor for a peripheral driving circuit (driver circuit) 13. In column 1, lines 8-48, Matsumoto states that an active matrix type liquid crystal display comprises a matrix circuit for applying an electric field and a peripheral driving circuit for driving the matrix circuit. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a driver circuit in order to drive the matrix circuit in Kadota's LCD device.

12. Claims 60, 61, 66 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota et al. '550 in view of Seo '521 as applied to claims 48-55 above, and further in view of Matsumoto 5,323,042. Kadota in view of Seo does not disclose a driver circuit comprising a second thin film transistor, wherein the pixel matrix circuit and the driver circuit are over a same substrate. However, Matsumoto discloses (see, for example, FIG. 1) a semiconductor device comprising a thin film transistor 12 for a matrix circuit and thin film transistor for a peripheral driving circuit (driver circuit) 13. In column 1, lines 8-48, Matsumoto states that an active matrix type liquid crystal display comprises a matrix circuit for applying an electric field and a peripheral driving circuit for driving the matrix circuit. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a driver circuit in order to drive the matrix circuit of Kadota in view of Seo.

13. Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota et al. '550 as applied to claims 46 and 47 above, and further in view of Mikoshiba 5,499,123. Kadota discloses a planarization film (resin film) 10. In column 5, lines 60-65, Kadota discloses the planarization film comprising an acrylic resin or polyimide resin used as an organic transparent material. Kadota does not disclose a first electrode over the organic resin film; and an oxide film of the first electrode in direct contact with at least a portion of a surface of the first electrode, wherein the pixel electrode is in direct contact with at least a portion of the oxide film, and wherein a storage capacitor comprises the first and the second electrode with oxide film interposed therebetween. However, Mikoshiba discloses (see, for example, FIG. 3B) a

semiconductor device comprising a capacitance element 400 wherein the capacitance element comprises a shading layer (first electrode) 312, insulating layer (oxide film) 314, and transparent layer (second electrode) 308. In column 4, lines 57-64, Mikoshiba discloses that a bias voltages can be applied to the capacitance element so that a brighter, clearer image can be attained. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the first electrode over the organic resin film; and an oxide film of the first electrode in direct contact with at least a portion of a surface of the first electrode, wherein the pixel electrode is in direct contact with at least a portion of the oxide film, and wherein a storage capacitor comprises the first and the second electrode with oxide film interposed therebetween in order to apply a bias voltage to an LCD device so that a brighter, clearer image may be attained.

14. Claims 69 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadota et al. '550 in view of Seo '521 as applied to claims 48-55 above, and further in view of Mikoshiba 5,499,123. Kadota in view of Seo discloses a planarization film (resin film) 10. In column 5, lines 60-65, Kadota discloses the planarization film comprising an acrylic resin or polyimide resin used as an organic transparent material. Kadota in view of Seo does not disclose a first electrode over the organic resin film; and an oxide film of the first electrode in direct contact with at least a portion of a surface of the first electrode, wherein the pixel electrode is in direct contact with at least a portion of the oxide film, and wherein a storage capacitor comprises the first and the second electrode with oxide film interposed therebetween. However, Mikoshiba discloses (see, for example, FIG. 3B) a semiconductor device comprising a capacitance element 400 wherein the capacitance element comprises a shading layer (first electrode) 312, insulating

layer (oxide film) 314, and transparent layer (second electrode) 308. In column 4, lines 57-64, Mikoshiba discloses that a bias voltage can be applied to the capacitance element so that a brighter, clearer image can be attained. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the first electrode over the organic resin film; and an oxide film of the first electrode in direct contact with at least a portion of a surface of the first electrode, wherein the pixel electrode is in direct contact with at least a portion of the oxide film, and wherein a storage capacitor comprises the first and the second electrode with oxide film interposed therebetween in order to apply a bias voltage to an LCD device so that a brighter, clearer image may be attained.

***Response to Arguments***

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 46-70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**INFORMATION ON HOW TO CONTACT THE USPTO**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene Lee whose telephone number is 703-305-5695. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on 703-308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Eugene Lee  
June 8, 2003



EDDIE LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800